

### I. REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-17 under judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,681,136. The Examiner contends that "[a]lthough the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims meet the limitations of the applications claims except for delivering it to a blood pressure regulatory point."


Applicants are accordingly submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the double-patenting rejection.

Applicants having answered each and every ground of rejection as set forth by the Examiner, and having added no new matter, believe that this response clearly overcomes the references of record, and now submit that all claims in the above-referenced patent application are in condition for allowance and the same is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact their Attorney of record at the telephone number below to expedite prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Francis Law Group

By

  
Ralph C. Francis  
Reg. No. 38,884

Dated: March 7, 2005  
FRANCIS LAW GROUP  
1942 Embarcadero  
Oakland, California 94606  
(510) 533-1100

I hereby certify that this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on this date 3-7-05 as "First Class Mail" in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

  
Name of person mailing document

